scription of three millions of dollars by the treasurer of Maryland?. \* that he hoped to be compensated justly for his services, without specifying any sum. At that time no means had been received by the company under the said act. I made no reply to or remark upon his message, and I have not since heard from him on the subject.

In prosecuting my application for the aforesaid aid for your company, I had to incur sundry expenses for expresses, conveyances, and printing—the particulars and vouchers of which I will furnish, as I doubt not that whilst I decline now, as heretofore, to accept any compensation for my own time and services, I will but conform to your wishes by enabling you to defray these expenses.

With great respect I remain yours, &c.

And since the date of that communication I have received a letter from Mr. Chew, in which he writes on the subject of said agreement, as follows:

Extract from a letter written by Philemon Chew.

UPPER MARLBRO' 26 June, 1838.

JAMES W. McCULLOH.

To James McCulloh, Esq. Baltimore:

Dear Sir,—As there appears to be no longer any difficulty in the way of the Baltimore and Ohio rail road company, availing themselves of the loan bill passed at the extra session of May, 1836, I take the liberty of reminding you of the agreement made by you with me on behalf of that company. My personal expenses at the winter and spring sessions were considerable, and even for these there has been no tender of remuneration.

Very respectfully your friend, PHILEMON CHEW.

This letter was addressed to me under misapprehensions; for, until quite recently the state directors of the rail road company could not furnish the certificate, which the law makes a condition precedent to any payment being made to it by the treasurer, on account of the subscription of three millions of dollars made to its capital stock by the State, under chapter 395 of 1835 '6. I have not reported these obstacles to Mr. Chew, nor the fact that strictly speaking, I had regarded his claims to compensation as having been waived by the loss of the bill at the winter session of 1835, and his omitting to come to the May session of 1836, until quite near to its close; but I have waited for the arrival of a time when I might present his own views of his claims to the consideration of both companies in a suitable manner, and with a prospect of gratifying his wishes and my own friendly feelings.

Secondly—As to 'what particularly induced me to employ those

persons' respectively, and in the order they are named.

With Joseph J. Merrick, I became acquainted in December